

BRNA ASSOCIATION INC.

A Texas Non-profit
4508 Aqua Verde Drive
Austin, TX 78746

DATE: October 1, 2018

TO: Zoning and Platting Commission, City of Austin

RE: C-814-86-023.01 Camelback PUD, District 10

REQUEST TO SEPARATE THE "DOCK DISTRICT" FROM LAND USE FROM ZONING PROCESS AT THIS TIME.

FROM: BRNA ASSOCIATION representing: Aqua Verde Subdivision, Live Oak Drive residents, Bunny Run residents, Charles Avenue residents, Hunterwood neighborhood, Lower Rivercrest neighborhood, Upper Rivercrest neighborhood, Creek at Riverbend neighborhood, Bridgehill Subdivision, Lakeside Subdivision, Carroll Subdivision, Westbridge Subdivision and URCD OA, LLC (52 individual boat dock owners)

BRNA does not support the Dock District elements as proposed by Applicant. It respectfully requests that the "Dock District" and proposed components, be separated from consideration by Zoning and Planning from applicant's PUD Amendment because for the following reasons:

1. In 2016, (re-affirmed on September 2018), the DSD (COA) Development Service Department) found neither the 1987 Hidden Valley Phase C, approved site plan or its approved preliminary plan identify boat docks on the property. They also found no discussion of boat docks or a community boat dock in the engineer's report, staff comments or in any material in the file. They determined that a boat dock could be allowed for each single-family residential lot with frontage on the Lake (approx. 12) assuming a single-family residence is either existing or permitted concurrently with the boat dock, and a site plan and any required variances for the boat dock are approved. Which it appeared likely environmental variances would be necessary for access to some or all dock.

2. No new subdivision plans, site plans or even a dock application have been submitted for review. All of which contain compounded environmental elements. Incomplete components and technical data have been submitted and continuously changed without engineer and surveyor's information. There has not been enough time for thoughtful discussion, analysis and determination. **"THIS IS A SHOT IN THE DARK"**, *Environmental Commissioner Guerrero comment*.

3. Clearly this added element to the Amended site plan is not superior. One third of the PUD Notes addressed the ever-changing non-compliant Access, Dock and Clubhouse. **SEPARATE THE DOCK DISTRICT FOR NOW SO THE APPLICANT'S CHAMPION TRACT TRANSFER AND THE MANY NEIGHBORHOODS REQUESTING SUCH CAN GO FORWARD.**

4. Many code modifications have been requested, including but not limited to, - building a septic lift station in a flood, mechanized access; building habitable structures in a flood zone on the outside curve of the lake and under a 200ft falling rock cliff. Dangerous precedents are being requested along Austin's drinking water supply.

5. We contend that the Applicant has no residential lots with frontage on lake Austin under the PUD Amendment because Applicant either dedicated those residential lots to the City of Austin as Parkland and/or seeks to change the zoning of the remainder of those lots with lake frontage to Commercial Use (CU) or Private Preserve Open Space (P OS). **It would be fair and reasonable that all Codes and Regulations be applied to all citizens fairly and equally.**

6. The "HOA Lot" reference on Applicant's Exhibit entitled "Camelback - Existing PUD vs Proposed Park Areas" was not applicable and would be deleted from the map. (Ms. Wendy Rhoades)

The proper place for discussion and consideration of this element would be after a Dock application has been received with site development plan and engineer reports.

Respectfully Submitted,

BRNA Association

Lyra Bemis, President